July 30, '76

Dear Harold,

Will send along the Dash Monthly ad for Betrayed if it shows up in the next issue, or a Xerox copy if not.

Thanks for clarifying on Roger Craig. Perhaps Penn will explain some day. I trust Molly and Rita completely, but over the phone there can sometimes be misunderstandings. I remember Molly told me a year or more ago that Roger had been shot at — at the time she seemed to think the woman he was interested in had done it. It was all another matter. I don't know, but under the circumstances I too feel suicide seems most likely.

There's some misunderstanding between us. My speaking of the (I think) foolish theory that Rose Cherami counterfeited Marina had reference to Morrow's book in which he embraces it. I pointed out that Joesten had propounded a similar theory, in line with my opinion that Morrow specializes in picking up speculations from the critics and feeding these back as the known truth. I'm not wrapped up in the matter or even particularly interested (I'm inclined to think Mrs. Hunter and Mrs. Whitworth are lying and the whole incident a fraud), but I was simply finishing up my evaluation of Morrow's book. (However, I'm sure I've wasted time fussing over the unnecessary — hard to avoid)

The recent Dallas indictments are another matter entirely. It's a complex story and the fact that both Nixon

and Morine are peripherally involved doesn't imply any direct connection between these two. But I do think Nixon probably had more of a connection with the Dallas assassination than has ever come to light. Penn, as I'm sure you remember, reported that Nixon, as well as J. Edgar Hoover, ~~were~~ was at the Murchison party the night of Nov. 21, 63 — and recently Prouty has come across a statement ~~discovered evidence~~ that Nixon was still at the Bottlers' Convention when news of the assassination broke, having changed his departure plan for some reason (of course the statement may be deliberately or inadvertently mistaken) Then — the tapes, the long gaps.

I do agree that some poorly informed self-promoters can raise a big fuss on peripheral assassination matters & that it's a nuisance and diverts attention from the important. But I'm more aware of this practice as a deliberate tactic. "They" love to pick up some sincere but mistaken bit of speculation mentioned by a critic, research it elaborately and expensively and to death, finally announcing as "wrong" something "they" knew was wrong all along. Simply to discredit the whole effort of the Critics.

Are the National Tattler people so terrible? I think they were probably infiltrated by one or more deliberate spoilers who pushed the phony. Without going over the articles again, my impression remains that they published a good deal that was substantially true, along with highly dubious stuff which they probably were unable to evaluate. They were reaching an audience that books do not, and the fact that they went under, to me, speaks in their favor.

I see that E. Howard Hunt is suing Glen Weberman and Michael Canfield & the publisher of Coup d'Etat in America for $2½ million. I haven't read the book & know next to nothing about Weberman or Canfield.

All good wishes, Madeline